PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

Case 8:15-cv-01535-JLS-DFM Document 1 Filed 09/23/15 Page 1 of 5 Page ID #:1

22

23

24

25

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- Jurisdiction of this Court over Counts I of Plaintiff's Complaint arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and 28 U.S.C. § 1367 grants this court supplemental jurisdiction over the state claims contained herein.
- 4. Defendant conducts business in the State of California thereby establishing personal jurisdiction.
- 5. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Westminster, Orange County, California.
- 7. Defendant is a business entity with a principal place of business in Columbus, Ohio.
- 8. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 9. In or around 2014, Defendant began constantly and continuously places collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt.
- 10. Plaintiff's alleged debt arose through a consumer credit transaction.
- 11. Defendant places collection calls from telephone numbers, including, but not limited to, 262-703-1977, 262-704-9780, 414-257-1975, and 903-593-8790.
- 12. Defendant places collection calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone at phone number 714-553-94XX.
- 13. Per its prior business practices, and based upon the timing, pattern, and frequency of Defendant's calls, each of Defendant's calls were placed using an automatic telephone dialing system.
- 14. In or around November, 2014, Defendant began placing multiple daily collection calls to

Plaintiff

- 15. On or around November 7, 2014, Plaintiff spoke with Defendant's representative and requested that Defendant cease placing collection calls to her cellular phone.
- 16. On or around May 7, 2015, Plaintiff spoke with Defendant's representative, "Sonya," and again requested that Defendant cease placing collection calls to her cellular phone.
- 17. Plaintiff revoked any consent, express, implied or otherwise, to receive automated collection calls from Defendant in the course of the telephone conversation on or around November 7, 2014 and May 7, 2015.
- 18. Despite Plaintiff's request to cease, Defendant continued to place multiple collection calls to Plaintiff on a daily basis.
- 19. Defendant placed at least three hundred and sixty-one (361) collection calls to Plaintiff over an approximate six-month period.

COUNT I

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTIONS ACT

- 20. Defendant's actions alleged *supra* constitute numerous negligent violations of the TCPA, entitling Plaintiff to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 21. Defendant's actions alleged *supra* constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violates of the TCPA, entitling Plaintiff to an award of \$1500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- Wherefore, Plaintiff, SASHA SUCHITE, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, KOHL'S CORP. for the following:

- 22. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each and every negligent violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § (b)(3)(B);
- 23. Statutory damages of \$1500.00 for each and every knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § (b)(3)(b) and 47 U.S.C. § (b)(3)(C);
- 24. All court costs, witness fees and other fees incurred; and
- 25. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

COUNT II

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 26. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all of the allegations in Count I of Plaintiff's Complaint as the allegations in Count II of Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 27. Defendant violated the RFDCPA based on the following:
 - a. Defendant violated § 1788.11(d) of the RFDCPA by causing a telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously to annoy the person called;
 - b. Defendant violated § 1788.11(e) of the RFDCPA by communicating with Plaintiff with such frequency as to be unreasonable and to constitute a harassment to Plaintiff.
 - c. Defendant violated § 1788.17 of the RFDCPA by failing to comply with the Fair Debt Collection Practices, Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.*, to wit:
 - 1. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by engaging in conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff;
 - 2. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA by causing a telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with intent to annoy, harass, or abuse Plaintiff.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25